REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-16 are now under consideration in the application. Claim 1 has been amended herein to include the features of claim 3. Claim 3 has been canceled herein.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 5, 9 AND 12-14 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 9 and 12-14 remain rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Nakagiri*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features of previously dependent claim 3. Since claim 3 was not rejected on the present grounds, the rejection becomes moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3 AND 10

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Nakagiri* in view of *Shimada*. Insofar as the Examiner feels the rejection of claim 3 now applies to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 defines a driving arrangement for an active matrix liquid crystal display. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, data analysis means arranged to receive the digital input data, to determine the color format of the input data, and to control the data driver to operate in the display mode corresponding to the color format of the input data. As amended to include the features of claim 3, claim 1 further recites that the data driver is arranged to consume less power in low resolution display modes compared to high resolution display modes.

The Examiner admits that *Nakagiri* does not teach that the data driver is arranged to consume less power in low resolution display modes compared to high resolution display modes. However, the Examiner contends that such feature is taught

by Shimada and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Shimada with Nakagiri. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons.

Nakagiri describes a device and method for displaying gray shades. A color data determining means determines color data corresponding to given image data. A frame rate controlling means decides gray shade data providing a specified shade of gray by giving frame rate control to the color data and deciding a frame function to which each color element is allocated based on the determined color data. Nakagiri describes the frame rate controlling section 3 as being used to control or "thin out" color data to decide a frame function to which each color element is allocated. This enables displaying a gray-scale color that cannot be displayed in 16 shades of gray and displaying colors in more than 16 shades of gray. (See e.g. column 6, lines 39-60).

Shimada, on the other hand, describes saving power by reducing the display size to 1/4 of the normal size. (See, e.g., Abstract). Shimada does not teach or suggest how the reduction of the overall display size for a display is related in any way to the ability to display different degrees of gray-scale color based on the input data as taught in Nakagiri.

Stated another way, if one having ordinary skill in the art was to be motivated to change the teachings of *Nakagiri* in view of *Shimada* in order to consume less power as recited in amended claim 1, it would not be in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Rather, one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reduce the display size of an image on the display in *Nakagiri* as suggested by *Shimada*. Of course, this would be completely undesirable in the system of *Nakagiri* as data having a different format would resultantly be displayed at a fraction of the original display size. This is completely different from the intended function in Nakagiri of providing different degrees of gray-scale color.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Nakagiri* and *Shimada* in the manner suggested by the Examiner. There is absolutely no motivation whatsoever in either of the references or in the known art which would prompt such a combination. Such combination would defeat the intended purpose of *Nakagiri*.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 10 is respectfully requested.

III. REMAINING REJECTIONS

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Nakagiri* in view of *Daher*.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Nakagiri* in view of *Koyama et al.* Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Nakagiri* in view of *Cairns et al.* Finally, claims 2 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Nakagiri* in view of *Misawa et al.*

Claims 2, 6-8, 11 and 15-16 each depend from claim 1 either directly or indirectly. Therefore, these claims may be distinguished over the teachings of *Nakagiri* for at least the same reasons set forth above. Moreover, *Daher*, *Koyama et al.*, *Caims et al.* and *Misawa et al.* do not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in *Nakagiri*. As a result, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

Mark D. Saralino Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: JANU2M 12,2005

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
B:\GEN\YAMA\yamap777.ceamd.wpd